

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team  
05 August 2009 at 16:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team teleconference on 05 August 2009 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-ops-20090805.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#august>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

Ray Fasset  
Eric Brunner-Williams  
Tony Holmes

**Staff:**

Rob Hoggarth  
Julie Hedlund – ICANN staff  
Gisella Gruber-White  
Glen de Saint Gery

**Apologies:**

Ron Andruff

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much, (Louise).

Good morning. Good afternoon, everyone.

On today's call we have Ray Fasset, (Tony Holmes). From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Rob Hoggarth, Glen DeSaintgery and Gisella Gruber-White, myself and we have apologies from Ron Andruff.

Thank you.

Ray Fasset: Great. Thank you.

This is Ray. Let's - I'll just start off with a little bit of housekeeping. I did not send out a real formal agenda prior to this.

A little housekeeping is it would be helpful if we could communicate to ICANN for the preparation of the Seoul meeting whether we need to have an in-person meeting or want to have an in-person meeting as far as Seoul. So we should consider that.

Obviously we're - there's still the plan to seat the new counsel as part of the Seoul meeting. If we were to have a meeting there it would be on the Saturday or Sunday prior to the start of the meeting on Monday. So let's consider that.

I'm thinking we probably will want to schedule an hour slot.

Man: I agree would agree with that, Ray. I think whatever happens whether the counsel is seated or not we need to pencil in that time. It's always easier to cancel than to rearrange I think. So we should do that.

Ray Fasset: Yes, and thinking back to Sydney I recall that Saturday was just an impossible day. Part of what we're going to do here is get a little ahead of the game and claim out our space if you will.

But will happen is all these other conflicts will arise as normally happens. And I'm afraid our work team may, you know, be the odd man out in our time slot. So I'm thinking Sunday might be better than Saturday. If - Tony, you know, your experience on these weekend meetings is more than mine. What do you think?

Tony Holmes: I think it would certainly be easier on Sunday as regards scheduling. I wonder whether it's possible for Glen to comment on this, because the way it was working last time there were many conflicts right across the whole Saturday and Sunday.

It would be far better if it was possible say there's a couple of across the day when these working groups could actually meet. I'm sure we're not going to be the only ones who need to meet.

And I don't know whether any thoughts have been given to that, Glen, or whether you could actually include that in to the preparation discussions.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, Tony. That's exactly why I sent out the note that I did to the chair is so that we can try and feed this into the discussion way earlier. And the idea to have these meetings on Sunday so that - because there are, of course, meetings that can overlap with what rooms - two rooms as we had in Sydney.

But I do know that Avri wants to keep Sunday afternoon eventually for the two house meetings.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Tony Holmes: You're right.

Glen DeSaintgery: So...

Ray Fasset: So Sunday morning is what would be what we're looking at then?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: That's it. Sunday morning is getting full.

Ray Fasset: Right.

Glen DeSaintgery: How long would you need? Two hours?

Ray Fasset: I'm not going to claim two hours. I think an hour would be sufficient.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. I'll pencil in an hour and a half. Thanks, Ray.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Did you say you only have two rooms to get all the groups in, Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, although there is a little bit of question on the schedule I see actually I put three rooms down for us. And if it's true I may take the three rooms, Tony.

Tony Holmes: Yes, I think that would be wise.

Glen DeSaintgery: It...

Tony Holmes: One of the things that worries me it isn't just for this group. It's through dialogue with some of the other working group chairs as well. You know, I think there's some concern that the participation levels have dropped away on a number of these groups.

And I think a lot of people use the face to face to sessions as a way of reengaging and catching up. So I would assume there would be quite a lot of pressure on rooms.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. Thank you very much, Tony.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Ray, this is Julie. Can I...

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...just make a note. I know that Chuck Gomes I think is planning on trying to hold a meeting of the Operations Steering Committee Sunday afternoon. And so then, you know, if we did have our meeting in the morning on Sunday then we have, you know, something perhaps to report into that meeting in the afternoon.

And I don't know whether or not he'll want the chairs of the various work teams to attend as well.

Ray Fasset: Great, great. That's good to know. Yes, so definitely Sunday morning would be to our advantage.

Tony Holmes: Okay. I assume from that Julie -- it's Tony -- that Chuck is working closely with Avri, because it sounds as though they both have different plans now for Sunday afternoon already.

Julie Hedlund: I hope that that's the case. I don't know that for sure, but I would expect.

Tony Holmes: Okay. If they are not coordinating there's no chance for the rest of us...

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Glen DeSaintgery: That's right.

Ray Fasset: So the next bit of housekeeping I would like to suggest is - and Tony since you're on the call with me are you available next Wednesday to have another call -- teleconference?

Tony Holmes: Just a quick check. I think, you know, it says - yes, I am.

Ray Fasset: Yes, I would like to call then, you know, if it's just going to be a two of us a meeting for next Wednesday and potentially try to make this weekly for whoever can attend that in the month of August we can really knock out this

Rules of Procedure document which I think we have the chance now to do based on the work Julie has done to get us in that position.

Tony Holmes: Yes, I would agree, Ray. Hopefully there should be at least one addition. I would assume Ron would be back. I'm not sure when (unintelligible) returns, but we are in the same situation as so many of these other groups where we're really struggling to engage with the required folks across the rest of the GNSO.

Ray Fasset: Now with that said at the end of the day with our work product we'll go to the OSC. And I'm not clear what the OSC does from there, whether they look at our work and the work of other work teams independently on their own or whether they go and try to get feedback -- broader feedback on some of the things. I'm not sure.

Does anybody know what happens at that stage of the OSC?

Tony Holmes: I can say what my understanding was, but Rob may wish to comment on that. I felt that the output from these groups would be fed into the OSC. And there would be then some broader discussion if there's any overlap or any contradiction that's where that discussion would take place.

I didn't think there was going to be any broader search for input other than the discussions at the OSC and what comes out of all of the groups. It's a coordinated approach. And that was really the role of the OSC, but that was my interpretation. And Rob is probably better place than I am to comment on that.

Rob Hoggarth: No, actually this is Rob. Tony, your recollection is spot on. The expectation was that the work teams would make their recommendations. They would be reviewed by the Steering Committee. And then the recommendation whatever form would then be passed on to the counsel.

And then it's really up to you guys. You're a member of the Steering Committee, Tony, as to, you know, how elaborate those discussion are or how you guys want to proceed when you receive the recommendation.

Tony Holmes: Thanks.

One of the concerns I have with this process, Rob, is if I'm honest is I think with the engagement is lacking to some degree. And it isn't just in this group. It's quite hard for the OSC to push forward and get anything to the counsel in front of the meeting in itself.

So I don't know what other time frame the other groups are working to, but at some stage there has to be some considerable level of discussion and real debate I would think in the OSC. That cannot occur until the working groups have completed their work.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: I don't know how that's (going to work) before -- so I don't really understand.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, that's a real challenge. I mean the Steering Committees are tasked with that general management and oversight and coordination of the work team efforts. And it may be a discussion that needs to take place the OSC, the Operating Steering Committee level.

There may be a value in Chuck - or the Chair calling for a brief meeting of that group or some email exchange where you guys look at the time table between now and Seoul and, you know, communicate to the work team, you know.

I realize that's what someone a fiction since you have a hat in both rings, but, you know, communicate to the work teams what needs to be done by when so that the Steering Committee can conducts its deliberations and pass on its recommendations to the counsel.

I'd also note, 'cause I've looked at in the last couple of days that you'll recall with the original implementation plan that developed this entire structure anticipates that the counsel must proactively decide to renew the charters of the Steering Committees and the work teams in Seoul.

So that's going to be a part of this counsel list as well. All your guys feedback about how participation, how things have gone, where things are going, what's been accomplished and what still needs to be done after soul.

Ray Fasset: Right. Yes, that's - this is Ray. This is - that's my understanding, too. You know, our primarily deliverable as it understand it right now is this Rules of Procedure document as we know.

And, of course, does not cover the whole depth and breadth of what the BGC has in mind for our particular work team. So it appears to me the way I've seen it is that our work team will not necessarily discontinue at Seoul.

We just have some things that need to be done for Seoul in order to seat the new counsel, but then these other things that are under our venue would still need to carry on. That work would carry on until such time as felt completed.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, and that'll obviously will be a counsel level decision. They may acknowledge that those decisions will have to be made and make a determination whether this is the right venue to do it in.

I think a lot of that decision making will depend upon how productive the teams have been and what their work product looks like.



Ray Fasset: Right. I agree.

Okay, so with that said I think the last housekeeping thing I wanted to mention was, you know, the document that we sent around it has - I just want to say it has been sent around to each of the constituencies. There has been feedback that has come back.

I'm calling it the GNSO structure document. There has been some feedback already. On the registry's constituency call I had today which is - you know, I'm a member of obviously there a lot of questions about it.

Some - from a position of well, definitely confusion, okay, and even one step further than confusion. So I addressed those as best I could to the registry constituency members and encouraged them to provide their feedback by response to the - Julie's email address.

Rob Hoggarth: Ray, this is Rob. What - your time table for that in terms of responses was three weeks I believe. Is that what the work team discussed after you circulated? So that's a time table for responses?

Ray Fasset: Yes, yes. I mean that's basically it. I did put that in the instructions. I probably should have, but yes, that's - as a work team, you know, we're looking at three weeks to see what we get back.

Tony Holmes: What is the closing date for that, Ray? Can you remember off hand?

Ray Fasset: The - what we had would have to have been revised, because it didn't go out on the original date.

Tony Holmes: Yes, that's right.

Ray Fasset: So it went out on - here. On the 23rd. I believe right? The 23rd or the 30th?

Julie Hedlund: I'm thinking maybe it went out on the...

Ray Fasset: Thirtieth?

Julie Hedlund: Thirtieth.

Ray Fasset: Yes, okay so the 30th.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I've just started getting comments.

Ray (Plzak): Yes, so the 30th - right. So the 30th. So three weeks from there I guess technically would be the 21. Although when Steven Metalitz did ask me that question I told him the 14th, but...

Tony Holmes: Okay. Certainly from the ISPs we're also putting back a response as well.

That was one of the reasons I was checking, but I think that the response that will be produced from the ISPs it's kind of be along similar lines to some of the other comments that have already come in.

Tony Holmes: But I don't think we can discuss this until that period's, Ray. And I also feel that it would be a - not appropriate to really any formal discussion around that without having Ron on the call with us either.

Ray Fasset: Oh I agree. I agree. That was just an housekeeping IM...

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Ray Fasset: ...to update for the record that the document has been sent and there has been feedback. All righty. Okay...

Tony Holmes: And thanks to Julie for circulating those in advance. I think that's helpful if we could get to see them if they come through.

Julie Hedlund: I do have another one that I just got today and haven't had a chance to send on. I forget whom it's from, but I'll send it off after this.

Tony Holmes: Thanks.

Ray Fasset: So, let's - if we could let's move right into the document that Julie sent over today which is the rules of procedure where it has now been updated specifically outlining those areas that are covered by the new bylaws that I noticed the board has - did not get approved in their most recent meeting.

Correct?

Julie Hedlund: That's correct. There were amendments that - additional amendments that have been sent out for public comment. And those went out on Monday of this week, on the 4th -- 3rd -- pardon me.

Ray Fasset: Okay nonetheless I'll make the assumption for us that even so those amendments are not going to affect the areas that we think here right now is what we need to tackle.

Julie Hedlund: That's correct.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So with that said now I did not have a lot of time to look at these parts today. I'm probably guessing Tony has not either.

Tony Holmes: That is correct.

Ray Fasset: So this is another reason why I think we can start - we need to start moving into weekly calls.

Chuck Gomes, I do want to mention, did send me -- I was just briefly trying to find it real quick -- what looks like a time table for us to be working within given the fact that there needs to be review of what we do as a work team ahead of time before, you know, we get to October Seoul meetings.

So he gave me that kind of run down and I will find that and I will send that to the list for us to be mindful of.

Julie Hedlund: That will be very helpful, Ray.

Ray Fasset: Yes, he kind of back engineered or reengineered it backwards and it definitely was helpful. I'll find that.

Julie Hedlund: Ray, I was wondering if it might be helpful if I just gave a little bit of an overview of the document.

Ray Fasset: Yes. Yes, that would be great. Please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: You'll notice as you're looking through it that there really are a large number of sections that now are handled in the bylaws. And the way I've dealt with it in the document that you've received is that for one thing the document is marked up.

It's red lined so you can see the changes from the original procedures. And I have indicated the various sections of the bylaws that apply in the different sections of the procedures.

Ultimately when this is, you know, a completed document what we'll probably have is the actual bylaws as an appendix to the document and then live links within the document.

So that if you go say to Section 1 Description and Organization and that is language that is in the bylaws then you would click on that link and it would go to the language that's, you know, in the appendix.

What we're trying to avoid -- and this is something that Rob and Kim Bauer and I have discussed -- is is not to duplicate language that's in the bylaws in the operating procedures.

There are number of good reasons for that. Probably the best is that we really don't want any confusion where this official language appears. If it's in the bylaws then it's only in the bylaws and we reference it.

But for the purpose of this work team anything that is indicated as C ICANN bylaws Article X, you know, etcetera, etcetera that's something that this work team does not have to address. So that would be the first thing to look for as you're going through the document.

And then what I did was I highlighted in yellow those sections that this work team does need to deal with. And so if you scan through you would see that, for instance we have addressed already in this team Sections 3.5 and 3.6, Quorum and Votes.

Those are highlighted, because those are things that we need to address, but we've done them so we don't have to do that, but then like the next section that we would need to deal with would be Section GNSO counsel chair.

Because while there is language in the bylaws some general language about selecting the GNSO counsel chair, the bylaws specifically states that the actual selection process would be detailed in the operating procedures.

And so that's probably one of the next things that, you know, that we would need to look at. And the rest of Section 4 also is something that we would

address except for Section - well, yes the rest of Section 4 and then Section 5 as well, pretty much all of a Section 5 except for Section 5.4.

The numbers - the number of votes cast is something that's dealt with in the bylaws -- in Article 10 of the bylaws. So I've highlighted these various sections.

As we will look through the document you may find - and I have made any sort of suggestive language changes that I think would be helpful for this work team to consider. And by no means are these things that the work team has to accept, but just sort of to get us started in the discussion.

But the - you'll find particularly section in - you know, language in Section 4, language in Section 5 much of this language is probably something that does not need to be changed and that it's - you know, the process is working well now. It's all very straight forward, you know.

Do you take meeting minutes? You know, when do you distribute them? That sort of thing. I think as we go through we may decide - the work team may decide that, you know, these are things that don't need to be changed.

And then you'll see that there are very large section - a whole section that deals with policy. Right now it is handle in - there are references to Annex A in the bylaws which is the GNSO Policy Development Process.

They're all work teams under the PPSC, the PDP work team and the Working Group work team that are dealing with aspects of the policy process. And there - they have not made any specific recommendations. They're still working through various things. So none of that is reflected here.

And I think that it's envisioned that this work team will try to get as much done as possible, the things that have to be done for seating the new counsel, but

there may be additional changes to the rules and procedures that may happen after Seoul.

And Rob, obviously jump in here and correct me if I'm wrong about any of this.

Ray Fasset: As a point I did have a conversation with Chuck Gomes, the Chair of the OSC specific to that question of areas such as 6, GNSO Policy Development Process. If those were not completed by Seoul would that impact the ability to seat the counsel?

His opinion and guidance to us was no it, would not.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, that's helpful.

But you'll see also then as you scan through Section 16 comes after the whole - all of the sections relating to the Policy Process and that's on the GNSO counsel email votes.

And again I think, you know, this is an area that we do have to address in this work team and it may need only minor changes, but it is something that we'll want to have I think ready to go. And I don't think that should be terribly difficult. As you'll note it seems to be very straightforward.

Rob, did you have anything that you wanted to add?

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Julie.

No, I don't think so. I think that the reality is just you guys being comfortable with setting up a process where you think you can move things along with the rest of the team.

We - you know, I think Julie, you and Ray have discussed this a little bit in terms of trying to provide you guys with the tools that you need. And that's really the purpose of the document -- to give you guys something to work on and providing you information that really focuses the discussions.

I think the heartening aspect is that it's not as daunting a task as we may have originally suspected it was. And I think Julie, you've done a great job sort of highlighting those areas that require attention.

But it might be a useful plan just to even go through literally section by section just so at the very least you can, you know, just put a check. Yes, we confirm we don't need to do this so that you can then spend some significant time on those areas that do require the conversation.

Ray Fasset: Yes, I think that's a great suggestion, Rob. I was thinking the same way.

Tony Holmes: Just one comment if I can.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

I think the approach that Julie outlined is great -- having the appropriate checks in one place. I'm sure as things move forward that's going to be absolutely critical, not just for this group, but for the other working groups.

So I'm pleased to hear that they adopt the same structure. What I would suggest is that there some boilerplate text added to the front of all the documents that actually describes that's the approach that's going to be adopted.

So in other words when you start to read the details of the document you're already aware that that's the situation. And if we can add that to all of the different working groups at the start of their documents then I think it would be quite helpful.



Julie Hedlund: Tony, I think that's an excellent suggestion and I can certainly do that, you know, with this particular document. And I think that anywhere we can make it as clear as possible what the structure of the document is - and keeping in mind, too, that when the procedures are complete yes, they will be online.

And people will be able to use, you know, hypertext link to scan through the document, but people will want to print it as well and it will be a printed document. So we, you know, need to make sure that any explanatory material is very - you know, it's very clear both in the electronic form and the printed form.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks.

Ray Fasset: I might suggest that we go ahead and start looking at these sections one by one. Tony, what do you think?

Tony Holmes: Yes, I'm okay with that. I'm not quite sure how we get with anything else today, right?

Ray Fasset: Right. That's exactly right.

So now to Rob's point maybe we could sort of tab those that are probably require further discussion versus that do not. So I think we would start with 4, GNSO Chair.

Julie Hedlund: Ray?

Ray Fasset: Yes?

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry to interrupt, but, you know, Rob and I were talking a little bit about this. And I think GNSO Counsel Chair is probably perhaps the most not difficult, but, you know, the one that probably needs the most discussion.

Ray Fasset: No, that's exactly the point of today though.

Julie Hedlund: The reason I'm saying this though is, because if we, if we might want to hold it to when we have more people on the call, because I'm sure that it's something that, you know, others will want to weigh in on.

Ray Fasset: Yes. Yes, we're saying the same thing. What I mean and sorry if I wasn't clear is...

Julie Hedlund: Sorry.

Ray Fasset: We'll look at the sections and say okay, this one likely requires more work and this one doesn't.

Julie Hedlund: I see. I jumped.

Ray Fasset: That's okay. Sorry I wasn't clear.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: But you did it though for us. So thank you. So let's just go and ahead and knock that one down. The GNSO Chair is one that is, you know, is more complicated than it's not. I'm not sure what terms to use.

Okay. So then, you know, we would then move now to 4.2. Right?

Tony Holmes: Before we go there...

Ray Fasset: Yes?

Tony Holmes: May I - - I had a question before that on Section 3.5.

Ray Fasset: Oh sure.

Tony Holmes: On the quorum.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Tony Holmes: I mean what it says there is absolutely true, but are we not at some stage going to insert some figures in there -- those two, the numbers? Because it should be pretty static at some stage what the voting number is on the counsel.

So isn't this the place that we would have that level of veto as well? I mean at the moment it just says that it's the majority of voting members, but at some stage we can put a figure on that. Is that your intention?

Ray Fasset: Well, I think the question that comes to mind is the bylaws some day eventually change that define that.

Tony Holmes: But the reason I asked that is because I can see us getting to a situation where whenever we call someone will be saying to Glen, what's your quorum?

Julie Hedlund: And Glen will need to...

Tony Holmes: She'll need to know where to get the information.

Julie Hedlund: You know, I'm not sure. That's a very good question. Rob, do you have a sense of this?

Rob Hoggarth: I think you guys can play this either way, you know, by not having a number one could argue that it's flexible, stands the time and, you know, is applicable whether it's ten members in the counsel or 50.

On the other end of the spectrum there may be some value in having specific numbers. And it's just a matter of the secretariat being aware that there are specific numbers in the operating procedures that have to be modified if the bylaws are changed.

I think in either case once this document is finalized Glen will have a worksheet -- I'm sure what tools you use now, Glen -- where, you know, you'll have that calculus in front of you.

As you know very well, Tony based on some of the discussion about voting thresholds and the rest, several of the voting calculations will become very complicated and Glen will literally need a spreadsheet for the meetings to be able to quickly advise counselors yes, this has passed or no, it hasn't.

Just because we've got, you know, majorities of house or 75% of one house and a majority in another house. And so those specials in and of themselves will have an additional layer of complexity.

So the bottom line (unintelligible) will release my input is you can actually go either way on this.

Tony Holmes: But that really says everything I was trying to say, Rob, because I'm aware even today from being on counsel that I feel very often all of us we have a question where we're unsure of thresholds and voting procedures and quorums.

And we always say the same thing and that is we turn and ask the question to Glen. Now how she deals with that obviously should be whatever works best for Glen, but somewhere or the other there needs to be a list of the threshold and what is a quorum in terms of definitive numbers.

So maybe that's something we should ask Glen what she would be happy with doing. Does she want it put into this document in terms of numbers or

does she intend to factor through her own spreadsheet or references in some other way?

Glen DeSaintgery: Tony, this is Glen. If you ask me I think that that would be something that we should have that is publicly published somehow so that everybody has a reference to it.

And I think we should get a mathematician to work out those numbers for us, because I don't think it's rocket science. I just think it takes somebody to sit down and work out the different numbers on the table.

Tony Holmes: So we need a definitive list somewhere or the other. It's just a matter of where we do that and how we do it.

Glen DeSaintgery: I think - yes, I think that would be - I think it must be publicly available.

Eric Brunner-Williams: As the only mathematician on the call I agree with everything that Glen said right up to the point where she said a mathematician.

Rob Hoggarth: Is that Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Well, welcome Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Hi.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you for joining.

Glen DeSaintgery: Eric, can't you do it?

Ray Fasset: I think that was a no.

Man: I think you volunteered.

Rob Hoggarth: Ray, this is Rob. I think Tony raises an excellent point that as you go through some of these discussions you may identify additional operating procedures that don't fit into any of these categories yet.

And, you know, Tony's suggestion would actually be something that fits in record keeping or something where it sounds as if there's a very good concept and idea of making sure that counsel members have access to, you know, the charts or whatever the tools are that can help them understand ahead of time what votes are necessary to pass certain things.

And something in the operating procedures that calls upon the secretariat to produce that on whatever basis, an annual basis or that every counselor gets this as part of their package of tools that they use as GNSO counselors might be something you want to think about incorporating into this, because that's the type of process and action I think that you'd like to have documented.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Julie, did you make a note of that as work team item for us.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, and actually there is a record keeping section that we'll...

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...pawn and we can make sure to see where it fits in at that point.

Ray Fasset: Okay. You see anything else with a 3.5 or 3.6 at this time, Tony?

Tony Holmes: No, that was the only point I had to make there.

Ray Fasset: Okay. That's a good one. Thanks.

So okay so we identified Section 4. Tony, I'm really, you know, relying on you on a lot of this stuff, because of your experience here. I'm really glad you're on the call. And Eric, of course, please speak up on anything given...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sure.

Ray Fasset: ...your experience and many years in ICANN.

So, you know, Section 4.2, you know, to me it just reads very, you know, face value. "A retiring chair will not be eligible for election for a period of one year." Do we see a lot of discussion here on that particular one?

Tony Holmes: It's something that we've discussed in the past. I think this is the general consensus that we've come to, but the problem with doing this on line, Ray, is that like you I'm reading through this for the first time.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Tony Holmes: And what appears to be okay may want a second read later, but I don't see any problems with that.

Ray Fasset: All right. So, let's have two camps here. We have the more challenging camp and we have the likely less challenging camp. So we have, you know, 4.0 propers -- 4.1 we're putting in a more challenging camp, right? And I just say let's put 4.2 in the less challenging camp. Is that fair?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Ray Fasset: All right. So 4.3, Meeting Schedules. Can we just take a moment to look at this. And again Eric, feel free to speak up. Do we see this as the more challenging aspect or less challenging?

Tony Holmes: I think this is less challenging or us. It's more challenging for Glen, but in general it's less. It goes in that camp.

Ray Fasset: Eric, you okay with that? I agree.

We lost Eric.

Let's go to Section 5, Conduct of Counsel Meetings. Now we have 5.1, accept as provided by Paragraph 6.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm still here and that...

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...that was easy.

Ray Fasset: Okay. All right. Any thoughts on 5.1? I don't have to read it. And we can take a minute.

Tony Holmes: No, it looks fine to me.

Ray Fasset: Okay, so you think a less challenging area?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Ray Fasset: All right. What I'm just going to suggest here is when we're done is that we're going to just take the less challenging areas 4 and dive into them in more detail in next week's call.

And Eric, in case you missed it we, because of these sense of urgency on this particular document for our work team we're going to move to a weekly schedule so that we can try to make this a deliverable by the end of August.



All right. 5.2, Notice of Meeting. Appears to me that's probably a less challenging one.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sorry for the delay. I was on mute. And yes, I understood. We're going to weekly calls. And you're going to have a call next with George (Unintelligible). Oh in any event I understood the urgency of this particular document.

Ray Fasset: Yes. So if you can join us that would be great.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, fine.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So okay 5.2, Notice of Meetings I already put that into the less challenging camp. Any objection?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Agree.

Ray Fasset: Okay. All right under 5.3, "all actions are vote to the - by GNSO counsel are taken or cast only by the members of the GNSO counsel and not persons who are not members. Again I -- okay.

Tony Holmes: You know, I think with that one, Ray...

Ray Fasset: Yes?

Tony Holmes: Okay, again it would be worthwhile maybe just make it a note that at some stage I think it would be worthwhile having a reference out to the place or wherever the information that we discussed earlier that's going to be done by the mathematician is residing.

We probably need to put a hook in there.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Ray, I didn't hear anything in that language about proxy.

Ray Fasset: I think proxy's coming up down...

((Crosstalk))

Eric Brunner-Williams: This section says, "only those - it restricts the university of voters (unintelligible) for counsel which doesn't provide a mechanism for counsel members to designate an exception for this rule on this particular rule.

So if the proxy reference external we don't know if it applies to this section or not.

Julie Hedlund: There is - Eric, there is a proxy reference later on. And I think maybe that's a good point that we need to make reference to it to that section in the same way that Tony has recommended that we make reference to the record's keeping section where we're talking about tracking what is - there's a quorum.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Right. I just want the exception if it exists to not be unlikable to this particular section where there may be the use - the requirement - the need for the exercise of the exception at some point in time.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, and it does exist actually. And I can, you know, make a reference here to that section.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay, I'll go back on mute.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks.

Ray Fasset: And actually not to look too far ahead, but when I look at 5.8 proxies it did jump out at me that it's blank underneath.

Julie Hedlund: Well, let me look at that.

Ray Fasset: Oh no, no never mind. I'm reading it wrong. My mistake. Never mind. That's what I get for jumping ahead. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: All right. So...

Julie Hedlund: I did in this next paragraph...

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...on 5.3 I did pull some language from the quorum section above, members representing a majority of representatives from each house shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Just a note.

Ray Fasset: Yes, I might put this one into the other camp -- the more challenging camp.

Julie Hedlund: So noted. I'll encapsulate this by the way, Ray, in summary to this meeting.

Tony Holmes: I think it needs some discussion so you should certainly do that. So I support that.

Ray Fasset: Yes. All right. Now Section 5.4 looks like a mixture as regards to the number of votes cast. There are some references to the bylaws and then there are some areas that are highlighted.

My first look at that tells me that this is going to be a more challenge area.

Tony Holmes: Agree.

Ray Fasset: Agree? Okay, let's put that one there.

5.5, Minutes now in that case I think we can agree it's probably not going to be as challenging.

And there's 5.5A, Procedures.

Rob Hoggarth: Ray, this is Rob. Just to understand the breakdown here. It seems to me that in breaking up the challenging versus the not so challenging you may even be able to bifurcate your efforts and potentially do the challenging ones in your in-person discussions during the calls.

And otherwise handle the non challenging ones by email or some other methodology.

Just a thought.

Ray Fasset: Yes. Yes, that would work well. We haven't been too successful on the email exchanges I have to admit, but yes, that's a very good thought.

I mean my thinking just so you know was we would spend next week's call - what I was thinking was that we would spend it on the less challenging items and just try to knock them all out if we could, but you're right though. The more we could get done through email exchange on the low bearing fruit definitely the better off we'll be. I'll try to encourage that.

Julie Hedlund: And Ray, and that - and I can - as I send the action items out from today's meeting I can set the action to have members review this document prior to next week's call.

And in particular to review the less challenging sections with a view to perhaps simply agreeing to them if people are comfortable, you know, as we

go through next. But I'll call them out so that people are focusing on those and perhaps it'll go a little faster.

Ray Fasset: Okay, that's great. Thanks.

Now 5.5A procedure is there any thoughts on this one?

Julie Hedlund: And then I should note that it's the procedure that pertains to the circulation of the draft minutes of the meeting.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Perhaps a little bit unclear.

Ray Fasset: Yes. Yes, that's a good point.

Tony Holmes: I think maybe we could tidy that up a little bit, Ray. So probably - I don't think it's that difficult, but I think maybe we need more discussion around that.

Ray Fasset: I'm with you on that one, Tony.

Okay, 5.6, Speaking at Meetings, I took a read through this. It seemed to make logical sense to me as is. So in other words I didn't see it to be, you know, really a challenging area, but Tony, given your experience in the counsel what do you think?

Tony Holmes: You know, it's pretty much the way I think it works.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: And it seems to work fine. So no problems with that.

Ray Fasset: Okay, 5.7, Seating. Again, seems straight forward and it works. Agree?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Now I think 5.8 and 5.81, Proxies and 5.82 -- I mean basically the entire Section 5.8 is going to be a little challenging. Do we agree?

Tony Holmes: Yes, agree.

Ray Fasset: Put that there. And that pretty much takes care of a lot of all the way up to 6. So there we have, you know, just a general rough consensus split out of these sections under per view. Does that work?

Julie Hedlund: Now there is actually - there's another section. Section...

Ray Fasset: Some more? Whoops.

Tony Holmes: There's Section 16.

Ray Fasset: Oh okay.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Sorry, not done yet, Ray.

Ray Fasset: All right. GNSO, Counsel Email Votes. Okay, again that's going to be challenging.

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Right. Okay. 16. All right. Anything else I missed? No?

Julie Hedlund: That's it.

Ray Fasset: Okay so, you know, let's, you know, let's definitely take Rob's advice on that which is great advice. You know, what can we do in terms of, you know, email exchange?

I think what we need to do is go back to each one of those we've now labeled as easier than not - than challenging. And, you know, are there that are as is -- I mean that just basically require no change whatsoever?

There's bound to be a couple of those that we would agree works and there's no change required.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Ray, I think you're right there. And I think that, you know, we probably just need to have people either assent to that on email or, you know, on the call, you know, next week.

And, you know, for those who may not be on the call next week we can simply say, you know, for those on the call we've decided that these section don't need to be changed, you know, send that out, you know, to the rest of the team as a follow on item from next week's call perhaps.

And then say, you know, if anybody has a, you know, an issue with this let us know, but otherwise we'll assume that they accept it as is.

Ray Fasset: So what I might do here is look at these sections we've marked easier. So now we're looking to split 'em between not only easier. They're done.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Ray Fasset: And what I think I will do is I will put out there an email for my opinion. My opinion is this, this section is completed. I'll quote this section in email and we can see if everyone agrees. All we need is for one person to say, no I think we need to discuss this and that's all we need.

Tony Holmes: Just a question on that, Ray.

Ray Fasset: Sure.

Tony Holmes: I'm aware on the calls that it's quite often those of us on here today, plus Ron and Wolf-Ulrich but how much wider is the full is for the group. How many people are on the list who don't show on the calls?

Ray Fasset: Well, this is the first meeting I haven't had our own little Wiki page open. Julie, do you have it open?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I can bring that up for you.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Hold on for a second.

Tony Holmes: Because I - what goes in here from here to the RSE really should have the support of the group. And one of things we could actually do is underline the fact that this is their final opportunity to comment on those sections.

Otherwise they're going to go forward as agreed from this group and they're part of that group.

Ray Fasset: Yes, well, they're all on the email list. There's - let's think about that for minute procedurally.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: I just wondered how extensive it was. I can't remember the full list, but what I think we would do is we would eventually reach a point of compiling the entire final draft of this document that would - of the Rules Procedures document



that would be headed up to the OSC and we would have a last call I suppose on the document.

Tony Holmes: I'd be pretty disappointed if people came back on those areas that we've identified early on...

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...as pretty stable. And then they suddenly say they have a problem with that.

Ray Fasset: Yes, that's a good point. That would be a little late wouldn't it?

Tony Holmes: Yes. Fair enough on the tricky part. Save some of that -- save some discussion, but on these parts I think most of us are agreeing there shouldn't be any later changes. So, it'd be good if we can get them to sign up of that now.

Eric Brunner-Williams: One thing we've done in other constituencies is note those who are participants during the lifetime of the task or working group or project so that the surprise objections at the end are - it's somewhat socially discouraged.

You know, I just looked through this at the ACF were a whole bunch of people that all haven't read the documents -- this is about IDNA -- I haven't read the documents, but I have the following objections or the following profound thought.

And that's not very useful. It's not helpful. And if we can get fairly good responses from the team that's good. And if we can discourage late and not terribly contributory responses that would be good also.

Tony Holmes: I think you're thinking along the same lines as I had exactly, Eric.

Ray Fasset: So do we need some rules of engagement here? Are you suggesting I might send out an email to the group that says, "You know, moving forward we will begin approving certain sections of the Rules of Procedures that have been identified -- that we've identified as under our purview."

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Well my proposal I think was similar to Eric's in a way that if we're getting to the stage where we think some of this text is now pretty stable we should at least notify all of them that this is their jobs to actually comment on those sections.

Otherwise they're going to be deemed to be agreed while we work on the other more difficult parts.

If they want to engage they should engage now.

Ray Fasset: So are you suggesting something to the effect of a notice on our email list that says, "We are looking at these particular sections. We, you know - our expectation is for you to engage on these sections at this time."

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, we're done with sections 5.2, 3, 4, 7 and 17. Speak now or forever hold your peace. We've got other things which are harder for us to do ahead of us and we don't want to come back and revisit these.

Ray Fasset: Oh okay. That's a little different. So you're saying after we get done we announce to the list that we are -- we feel we are done with these areas. If

you have any opinion on them please let us know at this time which is different than what I said.

I said we are working on - we are now beginning to work and complete these sessions. If you want to participate this is the time.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'd do both.

Ray Fasset: Do both.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Shoot first and then shoot last.

Ray Fasset: Okay. All right. I think that should come from me rather than Julie. Do we agree?

Julie Hedlund: Ray, I think that's - you're absolutely right. And I just wanted to let you all know it said the list of team members I have that's on our Wiki site is Ron Andruff, Eric Brunner-Williams, Ray (Plzak), Robin Gross, Tony Holmes, (Yulov Karim), Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen and Ken Stubbs.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Now as I inferred I sent earlier I had a terrible email crash. And anybody who's gone through that knows the pain I've been in for the past few days.

Is there a chance Julie, you can send me the email address again of those people? I know I had them.

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll do them right away for you, Ray.

Ray Fasset: Thank you for - thank you.

Okay. So that's an action item for me. And Julie will put that on our follow-up email of action items, right, to do?

Okay. So I - we're actually approaching the hour now. Is there any other business that anyone would like to discuss.

If not, I will recommend to adjourn the call. We'll follow up with - on Julie's action items. And, you know, I feel comfortable we have a way forward. And again I also want to thank Julie for her efforts in getting this together for us.

Julie Hedlund: Well thank you, Ray. And like I said I'm sorry I didn't get it out sooner, but I needed to see sort of the latest version of the bylaws.

Ray Fasset: I think you got it out in the nick of time and we were able...

Julie Hedlund: That's exact - that's what matters, right?

Ray Fasset: That's right. And this call it was - became productive as a result. So thank you.

Julie Hedlund: And you're welcome.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Ray, before we go.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Reading through the responses starting with George Kirkos I was struck by the no responsiveness of the comment for the off topic material within the response. We're not really asking anyone thoughts on how many seats we are.

Ray Fasset: Yes, well as a point of order what we decided on before you joined onto the call is it's not appropriate for us to yet deliberate on the comments we've gotten back. So we need a more fore all - Ron Andruff in particular we feel should be on the call to discuss the comments that we're getting back to this point.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, but my point is we're not letting George know that it's fine to make his points anywhere he wants, but not here. We're trying to solve some other problem.

Ray Fasset: That's a little bit of a catch 22. We did say all comments welcomed. So, you know, that was by design. And we know when you do that you basically are allowing all comments to be welcome -- all points of view. So...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay.

Ray Fasset: We'll deal with that. I think we'll vet that out and find what's in scope if you will or what is pertaining to the topic matter versus those comments that aren't. I think we'll be able to do that.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Any other business?

Okay, I would ask that the recording stop and we'll adjourn. And we'll meet up again next Wednesday at the same time 1600 UTC.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Great.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, everyone.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Ray.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, everyone.

Ray Fasset: Thank you.

Eric Brunner-Williams: See you then. Bye.

Ray Fasset: Bye-bye.

Tony Holmes: Goodbye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye.

END